



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,472	06/13/2001	Kevin T. O'Dougherty	N95.12-0013	5213

7590 07/19/2002

Robert A. McLauchlan, III
Advanced Technology Materials, Inc.
7 Commerce Drive
Danbury, CT 06810

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, JEFFERY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3653

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/880,472

Applicant(s)

O'DOUGHERTY ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey A. Shapiro

Art Unit

3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama et al in view of McCarrick et al (US 5,953,682). Murayama et al discloses the following.

As described in Claims 1, 11, 16, 20, 21 and 25;

1. a container (702);
2. storage means (401), coupled with the container, for electrically storing information relating to the liquid;
3. communication means for storing information to and reading information from the storage means (see figure 3b);
4. controller means(105 and 106), coupled with the communication means, for controlling processing of the liquid based on information read from the storage means by the communication means;

As described in Claims 2, 21 and 26;

5. the controller means comprises a user-interface (401) (note that the computer is considered to have a keyboard and display for user interface) capable of receiving input from the user;

As described in Claims 3 and 22;

6. the controller means further controls processing the liquid based on input received by the user-interface from the user (see figures 16a-16c);

As described in Claims 4 and 23;

7. the controller means further controls processing the liquid by comparing the input received by the user-interface from the user to information read from the storage means to determine whether the liquid in the container should be dispensed to a process (see figures 16a-16c and 17);

As described in Claim 12;

8. a connector head;
9. a probe (702a) extending from the connector head and insertable through a center of the cap and into the opening;
10. the probe having a flow passage therein (see figure 9);

As described in Claim 13;

11. a pump (701 or 702a) is coupled with the probe and with the flow passage (see also col. 7, lines 21-23);

As described in Claims 6, 11 and 17;

Art Unit: 3653

12. a cap for coupling with the container such that the liquid is sealed in the container (see figures 8 and 9);

13. a connector (201 and 202) for coupling with the cap such that the liquid can be dispensed from the container through the connector;

Murayama et al does not expressly disclose the following.

As described in Claims 5, 24 and 27;

14. the user-interface comprises a touch screen capable of receiving input from the user and displaying information about the liquid contained in the container;

As described in Claims 7 and 8;

15. the storage means is mounted on the cap and the communication means is mounted on the connector;

As described in Claims 9, 11, 17, 20 and 25;

16. the communication means is a radio frequency (RF) antenna and the storage means is a passive radio frequency identification (RFID) tag;

As described in Claims 10, 11, 14, 18 and 28;

17. the RFID tag comprises a passive RF transponder and an electrically erasable programmable read-only memory (EEPROM);

As described in Claims 15, 19 and 29;

18. the EEPROM stores information about the liquid contained in the container;

McCarrick et al (US 5,953,682) discloses the following.

As described in Claims 5, 24 and 27;

14. the user-interface comprises a touch screen capable of receiving input from the user and displaying information about the liquid contained in the container (note that a touch screen is considered to be a functional equivalent of the computer screen of Murayama et al—see, for example, Bathe et al, col. 6, lines 30-33 or Kar et al, col. 7, lines 43-45;

As described in Claims 7 and 8;

15. the storage means (323) is mounted on the cap and the communication means is mounted on the connector; (Note that mounting the storage means in the cap or in the connector, and vice-versa with the communication means, are considered to be functional equivalents to each other.)

As described in Claims 9, 11, 17, 20 and 25;

16. the communication means is a radio frequency (RF) antenna and the storage means is a passive radio frequency identification (RFID) tag; (Note that an RF antenna and RFID tag is considered to be a functional equivalent of both the communication means of McCarrick et al and of Murayama et al. See Rosch et al, for example.)

As described in Claims 10, 11, 14, 18 and 28;

17. the RFID tag comprises a passive RF transponder and an electrically erasable programmable read-only memory (EEPROM);

Art Unit: 3653

(Again, this is considered to be functional equivalent of the communication means of McCarrick et al and of Murayama et al. See Rosch et al, for example.)

As described in Claims 15, 19 and 29;

18. the EEPROM stores information about the liquid contained in the container (see abstract of McCarrick et al, for example);

Both Murayama et al and McCarrick et al are analogous art since they both concern computer controlled gas tracking and release systems.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the gas tracking and release system of McCarrick et al.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide data on the gas to the release system. See abstract of McCarrick et al, for example.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to obtain the invention as specified in Claims 1-29.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. McCord (US 6,161,706 and 6,318,568 B1), Fallah et al, and McCarrick et al (US 5,949,049) are cited as examples of gas cylinder tracking systems.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey A. Shapiro whose telephone number is (703)308-3423. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.


Art Unit: 3653

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald P. Walsh can be reached on (703)306-4173. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-2571 for regular communications and (703)308-2571 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1113.



Jeffrey A. Shapiro
Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 3653



DONALD P. WALSH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

July 15, 2002